

Quasi-Leontief Utility Functions on Partially Ordered Sets II: Nash Equilibria

*Walter Briec, QiBin Liang and Charles Horvath [†]

January 12, 2013

Abstract: We prove that, under appropriate conditions, an abstract game with quasi-Leontief payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{j=1}^n X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a Nash equilibria. When all the payoff functions are globally quasi-Leontief, the existence and the characterization of efficient Nash equilibria mainly follows from the analysis carried out in part I. When the payoff functions are individually quasi-Leontief functions the matter is somewhat more complicated. We assume that all the strategy spaces are compact topological semilattices, and under appropriate continuity conditions on the payoff functions, we show that there exists an efficient Nash equilibria using the Eilenberg-Montgomery Fixed Point Theorem for acyclic valued upper semicontinuous maps defined on an absolute retract and some non trivial properties of topological semilattices. The map in question is defined on the set of Nash equilibria and its fixed points are exactly the efficient Nash equilibria.

Keywords: Leontief utility functions, Quasi-Leontief utility functions, efficient points, Nash equilibria, semilattices, topological semilattices.

AMS classification: 06A12, 22A26, 49J27, 91A44, 91B02

*University of Perpignan, Department of Economics, 52 avenue Paul Alduy, 66800 Perpignan, France.

[†]University of Perpignan, 52 avenue Paul Alduy, 66800 Perpignan, France.

1 Introduction

Given a family of sets and functions $S_i \subset X_i$ and $u_i : \prod_{j \in [n]} X_j \rightarrow \Lambda$, a Nash point of the abstract game $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, S_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ is an element x^* of the product space such $\prod_{j \in [n]} S_j$ that, for all $j \in [n]$, $x_j^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_j[x_{-j}^*]; S_j)$; $\mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the possibly empty set of Nash Points of the abstract game $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, S_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$. In this section we investigate the existence of Nash points in the context of quasi-Leontief functions. If all the payoff functions u_i are individually (respectively globally) quasi-Leontief functions we will say that $\mathcal{G}$ is an individually (respectively globally) quasi-Leontief game. A quasi-Leontief game is a game which is indifferently either individually or globally quasi-Leontief. Of course, anything that is true of all individually quasi-Leontief games is also true of globally quasi-Leontief games. We will write $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ for an abstract game for which, for all $i \in [n]$, $S_i = X_i$.

If each S_i has a largest element $\bar{z}_i$ then the problem of the existence of Nash points is trivial and $\bar{z}$ is a Nash Point.

We will say that $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ is an **efficient Nash point for player i** if it is a Nash point and $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*]_{|S_i}; S_i)$ and that x^* is an **efficient Nash point** if it is efficient for all the players.

In section 2 the strategy spaces are partially ordered spaces, or inf-semilattices, and the payoff functions are globally quasi-Leontief on the product of the strategy spaces; all the results follow from the previous analysis of quasi-Leontief functions on partially ordered spaces. Assuming that the constraint sets S_i are comprehensive and bounded above subsets of inf-semilattices X_i , on can characterize efficient Nash points.

In section 3 the payoff functions are individually quasi-Leontief and the structure of the strategy spaces is much more restricted, but more classical; the strategy spaces are compact topological spaces endowed with an inf-semilattice structure for which the inf operation is continuous, as is the case, for example, for compact sub inf-semilattices of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Also, the payoff functions are real valued and continuous. The existence of Nash points in this context does not follow from any of the previously established results and requires some topological machinery. We prove the existence of efficient Nash points using the Eilenberg-Montgomery Theorem and some non trivial facts on the topology of inf-semilattices.

2 Globally quasi-Leontief games

Finding a Nash point for a globally quasi-Leontief game with n players can be reduced to n independent maximization problems. This is content of Proposition 2.0.1 below which settles the problem of the existence of Nash points for globally quasi-Leontief games under the hypothesis that for all

$j \in [n]$ $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i; \prod_{j \in [n]} S_j) \neq \emptyset$. Let $S = \prod_{j \in [n]} S_j$ and for all $i \in [n]$ let $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)_i$ be the projection of $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)$ on S_i .

Proposition 2.0.1 *For all globally quasi-Leontief games $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, S_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ we have*

$$\prod_{i \in [n]} \operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)_i \subset \mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G}).$$

Proof: If one of the sets $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)$ is empty there is nothing to prove. For all $i \in [n]$ pick an element $z^{[i]}$ of $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)$ and let $x_i^* = z_i^{[i]}$. We will show that x^* is a Nash point. For all $x_i \in S_i$ we have $u_i(z^{[i]}) \geq u_i(x_{-i}^*; x_i)$, that is $u_i[z_{-i}^{[i]}](z_i^{[i]}) \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)$; and trivially we have $u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i) \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)$. From the remarks following Proposition 3.1.2 of Part I, we have

$$u_i[z_{-i}^{[i]}]^\#(u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)) = u_i[x_{-i}^*]^\#(u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)) = u_{i,i}^\#(u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)) \quad (2.1)$$

where $u_{i,i}^\#$ is the i -th coordinate of $u_i^\#$. Again, from $u_i[z_{-i}^{[i]}](z_i^{[i]}) \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)$ we have

$$z_i^{[i]} \geq u_i[z_{-i}^{[i]}]^\#(u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)). \quad (2.2)$$

From (2.1) and (2.2) we get $z_i^{[i]} \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*]^\#(u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i))$ or $u_i[x_{-i}^*](z_i^{[i]}) \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i)$ that is $u_i(x^*) \geq u_i(x_{-i}^*; x_i)$. $\square$

The next result shows that, under appropriate but by now familiar conditions, a globally quasi-Leontief game has a Nash point which is also a maximal element of the strategy space.

Proposition 2.0.2 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, S_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be a globally quasi-Leontief game such that, for all $i \in [n]$, S_i is a non empty comprehensive (CUC) subset of X_i with an upper bound $\bar{x}_i \in X_i$. Then*

$$\mathbf{Max}(\prod_{i \in [n]} S_i) \cap \mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof: The set $S = \prod_{i \in [n]} S_i$ is clearly non empty, comprehensive and bounded above; one easily shows that it is also (CUC) since a projection of a chain in the product space is a chain. By Theorem 2.4.3 of Part I, $\mathbf{Max}(S) \cap \operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S) \neq \emptyset$, for all $i \in [n]$; in the proof of Proposition 2.0.1 we take $z^{[i]}$ in $\mathbf{Max}(S) \cap \operatorname{argmax}(u_i; S)$. Let us see that $x^* \in \mathbf{Max}(S)$. Let $x \in S$ such that $x \geq x^*$; from $x_i \geq z_i^{[i]}$ we have $(z_{-i}^{[i]}; x_i) \geq z^{[i]}$ and from $(z_{-i}^{[i]}; x_i) \in S$ we obtain $(z_{-i}^{[i]}; x_i) = z^{[i]}$ and consequently $x_i = z_i^{[i]}$, and since i was arbitrary, $x = x^*$. $\square$

2.1 Efficient Nash points of globally quasi-Leontief games.

In this section, each X_i is an inf-semilattice and each S_i is a nonempty comprehensive subset of X_i with an upper bound $\bar{x}_i \in X_i$. By Proposition 2.3.5 of Part I, there are quasi-Leontief functions $u_{i,j} : S_i \rightarrow \Lambda$, $i, j \in [n]$ such that, for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} S_i$, $u_i(x) = \min_{j \in [n]} u_{i,j}(x_j)$. For all $i \in [n]$ let $\tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}) = \min_{j \neq i} u_{i,j}(x_j)$; it is a globally quasi-Leontief function defined on $\prod_{j \neq i} X_j$. We have $u_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \min\{u_{i,i}(x_i), \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i})\}$.

A point $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ is a Nash point if and only if, for all $i \in [n]$, the following condition holds:

$$(N_i) \quad \forall x_i \in X_i \quad u_{i,i}(x_i^*) \geq \min\{u_{i,i}(x_i), \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)\}.$$

If $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then (N_i) holds. If x^* is a Nash point such that $x_i^* \notin \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then there exists $x_i \in X_i$ such that $u_{i,i}(x_i) > u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$ and therefore, by (N_i) , $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$; and this inequality obviously imply (N_i) .

If the inequality $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ does not hold then (N_i) implies that $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$.

If $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$, since S_i is comprehensive.

If $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) \geq \min_{j \neq i} \{u_{i,j}(x_j^*)\}$ then, from $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) = u_{i,i}(u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*))$,

$x_j^* \geq u_{j,j}^\circ(x_j^*)$ and the fact that $u_{i,j}$ is isotone we have

$$u_{i,i}(u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*)) \geq \min_{j \neq i} \{u_{i,j}(x_j^*)\} \geq \min_{j \neq i} \{u_{i,j}(u_{j,j}^\circ(x_j^*))\}.$$

Proposition 2.1.1 *If, for all $i \in [n]$, S_i is a comprehensive subset of the inf-semilattice X_i and if, for all $i \in [n]$, $u_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \min_{i \in [n]} u_{i,j}(x_j)$, where $u_{i,j} : X_j \rightarrow \Lambda$ is a quasi-Leontief function, then a point $x^* \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ is a Nash point if and only if, for all $i \in [n]$,*

$$x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i) \tag{2.3}$$

or

$$u_{i,i}(x_i^*) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*) \tag{2.4}$$

Furthermore, if $(x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ is a Nash point then so is $(u_{1,1}^\circ(x_1^*), \dots, u_{n,n}^\circ(x_n^*))$ and, for all $i \in [n]$, $u_i((x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) \geq u_i(u_{1,1}^\circ(x_1^*), \dots, u_{n,n}^\circ(x_n^*))$.

The meaning of Proposition 2.1.1 is that the search of a Nash point for a globally quasi-Leontief game on comprehensive and bounded strategy spaces S_i can always be reduced to n independent and decoupled maximization problems – $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ – and that one can choose $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$.

Recall that x^* is an efficient Nash point for player i if $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*]_{S_i}, S_i)$ that is, if $[x_i \in S_i \text{ and } u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i) \geq u_i(x^*)]$ implies $x_i \geq x_i^*$, which is equivalent to

$$[x_i \in S_i \text{ and } u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq \min\{u_{i,i}(x_i^*), \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)\}] \text{ implies } x_i \geq x_i^* \tag{2.5}$$

(a1) If $\tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$ then (2.5) becomes: $[x_i \in S_i \text{ and } u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)]$ implies $x_i \geq x_i^*$.

If $x_i^* \notin \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \in S_i$ and $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \notin \uparrow(x_i^*)$, since $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \neq x_i^*$, and $u_{i,i}(u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*)) = u_{i,i}(x_i^*) = \min\{u_{i,i}(x_i^*), \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)\}$ and therefore (2.5) does not hold.

If $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then (2.5) holds.

A Nash point x^* such that $\tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$ is efficient for player i if and only if $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$. We also have $u_i(x^*) = u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$.

(a2) If $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ then (2.5) becomes: $[x_i \in S_i \text{ and } u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)]$ implies $x_i \geq x_i^*$.

If $x_i^* \notin \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ then $u_{i,i}(u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*)) = u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$, $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \in S_i$ and $u_{i,i}^\circ(x_i^*) \notin \uparrow(x_i^*)$ and therefore (2.5) does not hold.

If $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ and (2.5) does not hold then there exists $x_i \in S_i$ such that $x_i \notin \uparrow(x_i^*)$ and $u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$.

We cannot have $u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$ since this would imply $x_i \geq x_i^*$; therefore $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > u_{i,i}(x_i)$. We have shown that

$$\exists x_i \in S_i \text{ such that } u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*). \quad (2.6)$$

Reciprocally, if (2.6) holds we cannot have $x_i \geq x_i^*$, since $u_{i,i}$ is isotone, and therefore (2.5) does not hold.

A Nash point x^* such that $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ is efficient for player i if and only if $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ and, for all $x_i \in S_i$, either $u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$ or $\tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i)$. We also have $u_i(x^*) = \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$.

Now, let us assume that X_i is a topological semilattice and that S_i is a connected subset of X_i . If $u_{i,i}$ is continuous on S_i and if $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ and $\tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i)$ for at least one x_i in S_i then there must exist $x_i' \in S_i$ such that $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > u_{i,i}(x_i') > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$.

If X_i is a topological semilattice and that S_i is a connected subset of X_i , a Nash point x^* such that $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ is efficient for player i if and only if $x_i^* \in \mathcal{E}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ and, for all $x_i \in S_i$, $u_{i,i}(x_i) \geq u_{i,i}(x_i^*)$, that is $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmin}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$. Therefore, a Nash point x^* such that $x_i^* \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_{i,i}; S_i)$ can not be efficient for player i , unless $u_{i,i}$ is constant.

What is the meaning of the inequality $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$? Assume that all the strategy spaces X_j are topological spaces and that all the functions $u_{i,j}$, $j \in [n]$, are continuous. One can find, for all $j \in [n]$, a neighbourhood $V_j^{[i]}$ of x_j^* in S_j such that, for all $x \in V^{[i]} = \prod_{j \in [n]} V_j^{[i]}$, $u_{i,i}(x_i) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i})$ and therefore, for all $x \in V^{[i]}$,

$$u_i(x) = \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}) \quad (2.7)$$

that is:

if $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_i(x_{-i}^*)$ then, in a neighbourhood $V^{[i]}$ of x^* , the payoff function

u_i of player i is a function of the strategies of the remaining players and not of its own strategy.

If x^* is such that, for all $i \in [n]$, $u_{i,i}(x_i^*) > \tilde{u}_{-i}(x_{-i}^*)$ then there exists a neighbourhood W of x^* in $\prod_{i \in [n]} S_i$ (for example the intersection of all the $V^{[j]}$ above), on which, for all $i \in [n]$, the payoff function of player i depends only on the strategies of the remaining players; more precisely, for all $i \in [n]$ and all $x \in W$,

$$u_i(x) = \tilde{u}_{-i}(x_{-i}). \quad (2.8)$$

Let us look at an example with two players.

$$S_1 = [0, 2], S_2 = [0, 2], u_{1,1}(x_1) = \begin{cases} 2x_1 & \text{if } 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1 \\ 2 & \text{if } 1 \leq x_1 \end{cases}, u_{1,2}(x_2) = \frac{x_2}{2}$$

$$\text{and, } u_{2,1}(x_1) = \frac{x_1}{2}, u_{2,2}(x_2) = \begin{cases} 2x_2 & \text{if } 0 \leq x_2 \leq 1 \\ 2 & \text{if } 1 \leq x_2 \end{cases}.$$

Take $x_1^* = 1, x_2^* = 1$; we then have $u_{1,1}(x_1^*) = u_{2,2}(x_2^*)$, $u_{1,2}(x_2^*) = u_{2,1}(x_1^*) = \frac{1}{2}$

$$\text{and therefore } \begin{cases} u_1(x_1^*, x_2^*) = u_{1,2}(x_2^*) = \frac{1}{2} \\ u_2(x_1^*, x_2^*) = u_{2,1}(x_1^*) = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \quad \text{and also } u_1(3/4, x_2^*) = u_1(x_1^*, x_2^*)$$

with $x_1^* > 3/4$ and similarly for u_2 . In conclusion at the Nash point $(x_1^*, x_2^*) = (1, 1)$ the payoff of player 1 depends only on the strategy of player 2 and not on its own strategy and similarly for player 2. As one can see, $(1, 1)$ is not an efficient Nash point. But, also, $(2, 2)$ is a Nash point since it is the largest element of $S_1 \times S_2$. There is an efficient Nash point: $(0, 0)$. It gives the smallest possible payoff to both players. So, a Nash point that gives the largest possible payoff to both players is not efficient and the Nash point that gives the smallest possible payoff to both players is efficient.

The problem of the existence of efficient Nash points for individually - and therefore globally - quasi-Leontief games will be treated in the next section.

3 Individually quasi-Leontief games

Let us start by defining some of the concepts that will be needed to state the theorem from which the existence of Nash points for individually quasi-Leontief games will be deduced.

We will assume that $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}$ and that all the strategy spaces X_i are **topological inf-semilattices** that is:

X_i is an inf-semilattice endowed with a topology for which the inf operation $\wedge : X_i \times X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is continuous.

We recall that a subspace Z of a topological space X is path connected if, for all pair $(z_0, z_1) \in Z \times Z$, there exists a continuous map $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow Z$ such that $\alpha(0) = z_0$ and $\alpha(1) = z_1$.

A subset C of an inf-semilattice X is **inf-convex** if, for all $x_0, x_1 \in X$, $[x_0 \wedge x_1, x_0] \subset C$.

An easy induction shows that if C is an inf-convex subset of an inf-semilattice X then, for all finite and non empty subset $S \subset C$, $\cup_{x \in S} [\wedge S, x] \subset C$.

Also, a subset C of an inf-semilattice X is inf-convex if and only if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) S is a sub-semilattice of X ; that is, for all x and y in S , $x \wedge y \in S$ and
- (2) for all element $(x, y) \in C \times C$ such that $x \leq y$ one has $[x, y] \subset C$.

Theorem 3.0.2 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be an abstract game such that:*

- (1) *the strategy spaces X_i are compact metrizable inf-semilattices with path-connected intervals;*
- (2) *the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{j \in [n]} X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous and such that, for all $x_{-i} \in \prod_{j \neq i} X_j$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{z_i \in X_i : u_i[x_{-i}](z_i) > t\}$ is inf-convex;*

Then $\mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 3.0.2 is a simplified version of Theorem 4.1 of Luo [8].

We know from Lemma 2.3.1 of Part I that for a quasi-Leontief $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function defined on an inf-semilattice X one always has $u(x_1 \wedge x_2) = \min\{u(x_1), u(x_2)\}$ and this implies that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \in X : u(x) > t\}$ is inf-convex. From Theorem 3.0.2 we have the existence of Nash points for abstract individually quasi-Leontieff games.

Theorem 3.0.3 *If $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be an abstract individually quasi-Leontieff game such that:*

- (1) *the strategy spaces X_i are compact metrizable inf-semilattices with path-connected intervals;*
- (2) *the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{j \in [n]} X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous.*

Then $\mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$.

In $\mathbb{R}^m$ with the partial order associated to the positive cone $\mathbb{R}_+^m$ order intervals are path-connected therefore, an inf-convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ is an inf-semilattice with path-connected intervals.

Corollary 3.0.4 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (u_i, X_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be an abstract individually quasi-Leontieff game such that:*

- (1) *for all $i \in [n]$, the strategy space X_i is a compact inf-convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{m_i}$;*
- (2) *the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{j \in [n]} X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous.*

Then $\mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$.

One can easily see that an arbitrary intersection of inf-convex subsets is inf-convex and that the union $\cup \mathcal{C}$ of a family of inf-convex subsets is inf-convex if, for all $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $C'' \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \cup C' \subset C''$; consequently, the following statements are equivalent:

- (a) for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \in X : u(x) > t\}$ is inf-convex;
- (b) for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \in X : u(x) \geq t\}$ is inf-convex.

Let us write $\llbracket x_1, x_2 \rrbracket$ for $[x_1 \wedge x_2, x_1] \cup [x_1 \wedge x_2, x_2]$. One can now easily see that C is inf-convex if and only if, for all $x_1, x_2 \in C$, $\llbracket x_1, x_2 \rrbracket \subset C$ and that condition (a) above is equivalent to

$$\forall x_1, x_2 \in X \quad \inf_{x \in \llbracket x_1, x_2 \rrbracket} u(x) \geq \min\{u(x_1), u(x_2)\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Luo's Theorem applies to a much larger class than the class of individually quasi-Leontief functions; it only requires the payoff functions to be “inf-quasiconvex” in each variable. But Luo's Theorem, which is derived from a Browder-Fan fixed point theorem for topological inf-semilattices, does not say anything about the existence of efficient Nash points. We will show that efficient Nash points always exists but this requires a Kakutani like fixed point theorem in topological inf-semilattices which can not be, at least as far as we know, established from the single assumption that intervalls are path connected.

3.1 Efficient Nash points for individually quasi-Leontief games

We assume that the strategy spaces are compact topological inf-semilattices which are metrizable and that the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{j \in [n]} X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous and individually quasi-Leontieff. We want to show that there exists an efficient Nash point x^* , that is, $x^* \in \mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G})$ and $x^* \in \prod_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*], X_i)$. In other words, we want to show that the map $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ defined by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \prod_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$ has a fixed point in $\mathbf{Nash}(\mathcal{G})$.

For all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ let

$$\mathbb{E}(x) = \prod_{i \in [n]} \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)).$$

Lemma 3.1.1 *A point $x^* \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ is an efficient Nash point if and only if $x^* \in \mathbb{E}(x^*)$*

Proof: If $x^* \in \mathbb{E}(x^*)$ then, for all $i \in [n]$ and for all $z_i \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*], X_i)$, $u_i(x^*) \geq u_i[x_{-i}^*](z_i)$. If x_i is an arbitrary element of X_i then $u_i[x_{-i}^*]^\circ(x_i) \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*], X_i)$ and $u_i[x_{-i}^*](x_i) = u_i[x_{-i}^*](u_i[x_{-i}^*]^\circ(x_i))$. This shows that x^* is a Nash point. From $\mathbb{E}(x^*) \subset \mathbb{P}_G(x^*)$, x^* is an efficient Nash point.

An efficient Nash points x^* belongs to $\prod_{i \in [n]} \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}^*], X_i)$ and to $\prod_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}^*], X_i)$ and therefore to $\mathbb{E}(x^*)$. $\square$

The set $\mathbb{E}(x)$ does not have to be an inf-convex subset of the product space since $x_1 \leq z \leq x_2$ with, for all $j \in [n]$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $x_{i,j} \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-j}], X_j)$ does not imply $z_j \in \mathcal{E}(u_j[x_{-j}], X_j)$ - being between two efficient points does not imply efficiency - all we have is $u_j[x_{-j}]^\circ(z_j) \in \mathcal{E}(u_j[x_{-j}], X_j)$. And this is the cause of some complications. The structure of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is the subject matter of the following short sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 3.1.2 *For all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ the set $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is not empty.*

Proof: Since $u_i[x_{-i}] : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and X_i is compact $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i) \neq \emptyset$; if $z_i \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$ then $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ(z_i) \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i) \cap \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.3 *Assume that the strategy spaces are all compact inf-semilattices with path-connected intervals. If, for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and all $i \in [n]$, $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ : X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is continuous then, for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$, the set $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is a topological inf-semilattice with path connected intervals. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is compact and it has a smallest and a largest element.*

Proof: From Lemma 2.3.2 of Part I, $\mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$ is a sub-semilattice of X_i ; if S_i is a sub-semilattice of X_i then, from $u_i[x_{-i}](x_1 \wedge x_2) = \min\{u_i[x_{-i}](x_1), u_i[x_{-i}](x_2)\}$, $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], S_i)$ is also a sub-semilattice of X_i and therefore $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i))$ is a sub-semilattice of X_i .

Since the topology and the inf-operation on $\mathbb{E}(x)$ are those induced from $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ the inf-operation restricted to $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is continuous. We have shown that the product space $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is a sub-semilattice of the product $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$.

Let x_0 and x_1 be two elements of $\mathbb{E}(x)$ such that $x_0 \leq x_1$. The order interval in $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is $\{z \in \mathbb{E}(x) : x_0 \leq z \leq x_1\}$ that is $[x_0, x_1] \cap \mathbb{E}(x)$ where $[x_0, x_1]$ is the order interval in $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$. We have to show that there exists a continuous path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ such that $\alpha(i) = x_i$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha(t) \in [x_0, x_1] \cap \mathbb{E}(x)$.

Choose a continuous path $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow [x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}]$ and let $\alpha_i(t) = u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ(\gamma_i(t))$; we have $\alpha_i(t) \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$.

Since $x_{0,i}$ and $x_{1,i}$ are both in $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$ with $x_{0,i} \leq x_{1,i}$ and since

$u_i[x_{-i}]$ is isotone we have $[x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}] \subset \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$ and consequently $\gamma_i(t) \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$. From $u_i[x_{-i}](\gamma_i(t)) = u_i[x_{-i}](u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ(\gamma_i(t)))$ we have $\alpha_i(t) \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$.

In conclusion, $\alpha_i(t) \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i))$.

Since $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ$ is continuous and X_i is compact the set of fixed points of $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ$, that is $\mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$, is compact; from the continuity of $u_i[x_{-i}]$ follows the compactness of $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i))$. This shows that $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is compact.

We have already seen that a compact inf-semilattice has a smallest element, let $\mathbf{m}(x)$ be the smallest element of $\mathbb{E}(x)$. But $\operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i))$ is totally ordered since it is a subset of the totally ordered set $\mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$; by compactness it has a largest element $\mathbf{M}_i(x)$; $\mathbf{M}(x)$ is the largest element of $\mathbb{E}(x)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.4 *Assume that the strategy spaces are all compact metizable inf-semilattices. If $\mathbb{P}_G$ is upper semicontinuous then $\mathbb{E}$ is upper semicontinuous.*

Proof: By compactness it is sufficient to show that the graph of $\mathbb{E}$ is a closed subset of $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i \times \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$. We have $(x, y) \in \mathbb{E}$ if and only if, for all $i \in [n]$, $y_i \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i) \cap \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{-i}], X_i)$. Let $(x_{\mathbf{m}}, y_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements of the graph of $\mathbb{E}$ that converges to a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. From $y_{\mathbf{m},i} \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}], X_i)$ and the continuity of u_i we have $\bar{y}_i \in \operatorname{argmax}(u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}], X_i)$.

The sequence $(x_{\mathbf{m}}, y_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$ also belongs to the graph of $\mathbb{P}_G$, which is upper semicontinuous; therefore $\bar{y}_i \in \mathcal{E}(u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}], X_i)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.5 *Assume that the strategy spaces are all compact metizable inf-semilattices, and that:*

- (1) *for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and all $i \in [n]$, $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ$ is continuous;*
- (2) *for all $i \in [n]$ and for all convergent sequence $(x_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$ of points of the product space $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ with limit $\bar{x}$, the sequence of functions $(u_i[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ)_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges pointwise to $u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ$.*

Then $\mathbb{P}_G$ is upper semicontinuous.

Proof: Assume that the sequence $(x_{\mathbf{m}}, y_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and that $y_{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathbb{P}_G(x_{\mathbf{m}})$. We have to see that, for all $i \in [n]$, $\bar{y}_i = u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)$.

Let d_i be a metric for X_i . From $y_{\mathbf{m},i} = u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(y_{\mathbf{m},i})$ we can write

$$\begin{cases} d_i(\bar{y}_i, u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)) \leq d_i(\bar{y}_i, y_{\mathbf{m},i}) & + & d_i(u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(y_{\mathbf{m},i}), u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)) & + \\ & & & + & d_i(u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i), u[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)). \end{cases}$$

Since X_i is compact and $u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ$ is continuous we can, for $\varepsilon > 0$ choose $\delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, if $d_i(z_i, w_i) < \delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\varepsilon)$ then $d_i(u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(z_i), u[x_{\mathbf{m},-i}]^\circ(w_i)) < \varepsilon/3$.

We can choose $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}(\varepsilon)$ such that $d_i(\bar{y}_i, y_{\mathbf{m}(\varepsilon), i}) < \varepsilon/3$ and $d_i(u[x_{\mathbf{m}(\varepsilon), -i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i), u[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)) < \varepsilon/3$.

We have shown that $d_i(\bar{y}_i, u_i[\bar{x}_{-i}]^\circ(\bar{y}_i)) \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.6 *Assume that the strategy spaces are all compact inf-semilattices with path-connected intervals. If, for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and all $i \in [n]$, $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ : X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is continuous then, for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$, the set $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is homotopically trivial.*

Proof: For all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$, $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is a compact inf-semilattice; we have seen that it has a smallest element and that it is path-connected. By a theorem of D.R. Brown, Theorem B in [5], $\mathbb{E}(x)$ is homotopically trivial. $\square$

A topological inf-semilattice is a **Lawson semilattice** if each point has a neighbourhood base consisting of inf-semilattices. For example, a sub-inf-semilattice of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a Lawson semilattice. A product of Lawson semilattices equipped with the product topology is a Lawson semilattice.

Theorem 3.1.7 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (X_i, u_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be a quasi-Leontief game such that:*

- (1) *all the strategy spaces are metrizable compact and locally connected path connected Lawson semilattices;*
- (2) *all the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous;*
- (3) *for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and all $i \in [n]$, $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ : X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is continuous.*

Then, $\mathcal{G}$ has an efficient Nash point.

Proof: From the preceeding lemmas, $\mathbb{E}$ is an upper semicontinuous map with non empty homotopically trivial values from $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ to itself. Each X_i has path connected intervals therefore, given two arbitrary points x_1 and x_2 of X_i there is a continuous path from x_1 to $x_1 \wedge x_2$ and a continuous path from $x_1 \wedge x_2$ to x_2 ; X_i is path connected, and *a fortiori* connected. By a theorem of M. McWaters, [9], condition (1) implies that each X_i is an absolute retract; $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ is therefore an absolute retract. Homotopically trivial sets being acyclic, $\mathbb{E}$ is an upper semicontinuous map with non empty acyclic values from the compact absolute retract $\prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ to itself. By the Eilenberg-Montgomery Theorem, [6] Page 543 Corollary (7.5), there exists $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ such that $x \in \mathbb{E}(x)$. $\square$

Corollary 3.1.8 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (X_i, u_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be a quasi-Leontief game such that:*

- (1) *X_i is a compact inf-convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$;*
- (2) *all the payoff functions $u_i : \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous;*
- (3) *for all $x \in \prod_{i \in [n]} X_i$ and all $i \in [n]$, $u_i[x_{-i}]^\circ : X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is continuous.*

Then, $\mathcal{G}$ has an efficient Nash point.

Proof: In $\mathbb{R}^n$ intervals are path connected; an inf-convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is therefore a subsemilattice with path connected intervals. Let x be an arbitrary point of X_i and let U be a neighbourhood of x in X_i . Choose a neighbourhood V of x in $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ such that $U = X_i \cap V$ and a neighbourhood W of x in $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ such that $W \subset V$ and W is inf-convex; W could for example be a box around x . Since the intersection of two inf-convex sets is inf-convex and an inf-convex set is path connected we have that $W \cap X_i$ is a neighbourhood of x in X_i that is a connected inf-semilattice contained in U ; this shows that X_i is a locally connected Lawson semilattice. $\square$

A final remark: The algebraic and the topological assumptions used throughout this paper are not as different as one could believe. The compactness assumption is natural and at the same time seems to be somewhat indeterminate but, as a matter of fact, there is at most one topology on a given semilattice for which it is a compact topological semilattice and continuity is defined entirely in terms of order convergence. For a lattice, that topology is explicitly determined by the algebraic structure of the lattice. For this, and more and topological lattices and semilattices see Theorem 15 and Corollary 16 in [7].

References

- [1] ALIPRANTIS C. D. AND BORDER K., *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*, SpringerVerlag, 3rd. edition, 2006.
- [2] ALLAMIGEON X., GAUBERT S., KATZ D. *Tropical Polar Cones, Hypergraph transversals, and mean payoff games*, arXiv:1004.2778v2
- [3] BORDER, K., *Fixed Point Theorems with Application to Economics and Game Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 3rd. edition, 1989.
- [4] BRIEC W. AND HORVATH C., *Nash points, Ky Fan inequality and equilibria of abstract economies in Max-Plus and $\mathbb{B}$ -convexity*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications Vol. 341, pp. 188-199.
- [5] BROWN, D. R., *Topological semilattices on the two-cell*, Pacific J. Math., Vol.15, N.1 (1965), 35-46.
- [6] GRANAS A., AND DUGUNDJI D., *Fixed Point Theory*, Springer, 2003.
- [7] LAWSON, J.D., *Intrinsic Topologies in Topological Lattices and Semilattices*, Pacific J. Math., Vo.44, No.2 (1973), 593 - 602.
- [8] LUO, Q., *KKM and Nash Equilibria Type Theorems in Topological Ordered Spaces*, J.M.A.A., **264** (2001), 262-269.

- [9] MCWATERS, M. M., *A Note on Topological Semilattices*, J. London Math. Soc., (2), 1 (1969), 64-66.
- [10] TOPKIS, D., *Equilibrium points in nonzero-sum n -person submodular games*, SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization, vol. 17, pp. 773-787.
- [11] VAN MILL J., *Infinite dimensional topology*, North Holland 1998.